

### REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed August 16, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 21-40. The Office Action rejected claim 21-40 of the present application under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-22 of U.S. Patent No. 6,727,467. Applicants overcome this rejection by submitting a terminal disclaimer herewith. For purposes of clarity, Applicants submit that the term zig-zag configuration, as used in the present application, merely means a pattern created by traveling along a path in a side-to-side manner, unless otherwise specifically stated.


### CONCLUSIONS

In view of Applicants' terminal disclaimer, the Examiner's rejections are believed to be rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and requests that the Examiner pass the case to issue at the earliest convenience. Should the Examiner have any question or wish to further discuss this application, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned at (248) 292-2920.

If for some reason Applicant has not requested a sufficient extension and/or have not paid a sufficient fee for this response and/or for the extension necessary to prevent the abandonment of this application, please consider this as a request for an extension for the required time period and/or authorization to charge our Deposit Account No. 50-1097 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 27 October, 2004



Scott A. Chapple  
Registration No. 46,287  
DOBRUSIN & THENNISCH PC  
29 W. Lawrence Street  
Suite 210  
Pontiac, MI 48342  
(248) 292-2920

Customer No. 25215